

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF FLORIDA**

CASE NO.:

NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO,

Plaintiff,

v.

PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO
PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, PHG
HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a
PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA
LLC, and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a
SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR
HOMESTEAD,

Defendants.

COMPLAINT

Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, individually and on behalf of all other similarly situated mobility-impaired individuals (hereinafter “Plaintiff”), sues PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD (hereinafter “Defendants”), and as grounds alleges:

JURISDICTION, PARTIES, AND VENUE

1. This is an action for injunctive relief, a declaration of rights, attorneys' fees, litigation expenses, and costs pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq., (the “Americans with Disabilities Act” or “ADA”) and 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202.

2. The Court has original jurisdiction over Plaintiff’s claims arising under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq. pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 1331, 1343 and 42 U.S.C. § 12117(a).

3. The Court has jurisdiction over this matter pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 2201 and 2202, and may render declaratory judgment on the existence or nonexistence of any right under 42 U.S.C. § 12181, et seq.

4. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, is an individual over eighteen years of age, with a residence in Miami-Dade County, Florida, and is otherwise *sui juris*.

5. At all times material, Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, owned and operated a commercial retail shopping plaza at 650 NE 22nd Terrace Homestead, Florida 33033 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Homestead, Florida.

6. At all times material, Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, was and is a Foreign Limited Liability Company which is registered to conduct business in the State of Florida and has the principal place of business listed in this complaint in Hollywood, Florida. Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC., holds itself out to the public as “PORTOFINO PLAZA.”

7. At all times material, Defendant, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, owned and operated a commercial restaurant at 650 NE 22nd Terrace Homestead, Florida 33033 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Homestead, Florida.

8. At all times material, Defendant, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company which is registered to conduct business in the State of Florida and has the principal place of business listed in this complaint in Hollywood, Florida. Defendant, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC, holds itself out to the public as “PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC.”

9. At all times material, Defendant, SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI

BAR HOMESTEAD, owned and operated a commercial restaurant at 650 NE 22nd Terrace Homestead, Florida 33033 (hereinafter the “Commercial Property”) and conducted a substantial amount of business in that place of public accommodation in Homestead, Florida.

10. At all times material, Defendant, SAKE THAI LLC, was and is a Florida Limited Liability Company which is registered to conduct business in the State of Florida and has the principal place of business listed in this complaint in Homestead, Florida. Defendant, SAKE THAI LLC, holds itself out to the public as “SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD.”

11. Venue is properly located in the Southern District of Florida because Defendant’s Commercial Property and businesses are located in Miami-Dade County, Florida, Defendant regularly conduct business within Miami-Dade County, Florida, and because a substantial part(s) of the events or omissions giving rise to these claims occurred in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

FACTUAL ALLEGATIONS

12. Although over thirty (30) years have passed since the effective date of Title III of the ADA, Defendants have yet to make its/their facilities accessible to individuals with disabilities.

13. Congress provided commercial businesses one and a half years to implement the Act. The effective date was January 26, 1992. In spite of this abundant lead-time and the extensive publicity the ADA has received since 1990, Defendants have continued to discriminate against people who are disabled in ways that block them from access and use of Defendants’ property and the businesses therein.

14. The ADA prohibits discrimination on the basis of disability in 28 CFR 36.201 and requires landlords and tenants to be liable for compliance.

15. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, is an individual with disabilities as defined by and pursuant to the ADA. NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO

uses a wheelchair to ambulate. NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO has very limited use of his hands and cannot operate any mechanisms which require tight grasping or twisting of the wrist. He has lower paraplegia, inhibits him from walking or otherwise ambulating without the use of a wheelchair. He is limited in his major life activities by such, including but not limited to walking, standing, grabbing, grasping and/or pinching.

16. Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, owns, operates and oversees the Commercial Property, its general parking lot and parking spots specific to the businesses therein and all other common areas open to the public located within the commercial property.

17. The subject Commercial Property is open to the public and is located in Homestead, Florida. The individual Plaintiff visits the Commercial Property, to include visits to the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property on June 29, 2023 and June 30, 2023, and encountered multiple violations of the ADA that directly affected his ability to use and enjoy the Commercial Property. He often visits the Commercial Property and businesses located within the Commercial Property in order to avail himself of the goods and services offered there, and because it is approximately two (2) miles from his residence and is near other businesses and restaurants he frequents as a patron. He plans to return to the Commercial Property within two (2) months from the date of the filing of this Complaint.

18. The Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, found the Commercial Property and businesses located within the commercial property to be rife with ADA violations. The Plaintiff encountered architectural barriers at the Commercial Property and business located within the Commercial Property and wishes to continue his patronage and use of each of the premises.

19. The Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, has encountered architectural barriers that are in violation of the ADA at the subject Commercial Property. The barriers to access at Defendants' Commercial Property have each denied or diminished Plaintiff's ability to visit the Commercial Property and have endangered his safety in violation of the ADA. The barriers to access, which are set forth below, have likewise posed a risk of injury(ies), embarrassment, and discomfort to Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, and others similarly situated.

20. Defendants, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD, own and operate a place of public accommodation as defined by the ADA and the regulations implementing the ADA, 28 CFR 36.201 (a) and 36.104. Defendants, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD, are responsible for complying with the obligations of the ADA. The place of public accommodation that Defendants, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD, own and operate the Commercial Property and or businesses located at 650 NE 22nd Terrace Homestead, Florida 33033.

21. Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, as landlord and owner of the Commercial Property, is jointly and severally liable for all ADA violations listed in Counts I through III, in this Complaint.

22. Defendant, PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA

LLC, as a tenant of a business within the Commercial Property, is jointly and severally liable for all ADA violations listed in Count II, in this Complaint.

23. Defendant, SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD, as a tenant of a business within the Commercial Property, is jointly and severally liable for all ADA violations listed in Count III, in this Complaint.

24. Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, has a realistic, credible, existing and continuing threat of discrimination from the Defendants' non-compliance with the ADA with respect to the described Commercial Property, including but not necessarily limited to the allegations of this Complaint. Plaintiff has reasonable grounds to believe that he will continue to be subjected to discrimination at the Commercial Property, in violation of the ADA. Plaintiff desires to visit the Commercial Property and businesses located therein, not only to avail himself of the goods and services available at the Commercial Property, but to assure himself that the Commercial Property is in compliance with the ADA, so that he and others similarly situated will have full and equal enjoyment of the Commercial Property without fear of discrimination.

25. Defendants have discriminated against the individual Plaintiff by denying him access to, and full and equal enjoyment of, the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of the Commercial Property, as prohibited by 42 U.S.C. § 12182 et seq.

COUNT I - ADA VIOLATIONS
AS TO PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC

26. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

27. Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing,

inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Parking

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking spaces are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking spaces located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff had difficulty exiting the vehicle, as designated accessible parking space access aisles are located on an excessive slope. Violation: There are accessible parking space access aisles located on an excessive slope violating Section 4.6.3 of the ADAAG and Section 502.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Entrance Access and Path of Travel (common areas).

- i. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel, as it is not continuous and accessible. Violation: There are inaccessible routes from the public sidewalk and transportation stop. These are violations of the requirements in Sections 4.3.2(1), 4.3.8, 4.5.1, and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Sections 206.2.1, 302.1, 303, and 402.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff could not enter tenant spaces without assistance, as the required level landing is not provided. Violation: A level landing that is 60 inches minimum perpendicular to the doorway is not provided at accessible entrances violating Section 4.13.6 and Figure 25(a) of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA

Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- iii. The Plaintiff had difficulty traversing the path of travel due to abrupt changes in level.

Violation: There are changes in levels of greater than ½ inch, violating Sections 4.3.8 and 4.5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 303 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT II - ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO
PLAZA RETAIL, LL and PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a
PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC**

28. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through 25 above as though fully set forth herein.

29. Defendant, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC, and PHG HOMESTEAD, LLC d/b/a PORTOFINO COAL FIRED PIZZA LLC, has discriminated, and continues to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered:

A. Access to Goods and Services

- i. The Plaintiff could not utilize the bar counter, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are bar counters that are not at the prescribed height, violating Section 4.32.4 and 5.2 of the ADAAG and Section 902.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Public Restrooms

- i. There are permanently designated interior spaces without proper signage, violating Section 4.1.3(16) and 4.30 of the ADAAG and Sections 216.2 and 703 of the 2010

ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- ii. The Plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatories outside the accessible toilet compartment have pipes that are not properly insulated. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully insulated outside the accessible toilet compartment violating Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 213.3.4 & 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not use the accessible toilet compartment door without assistance, as it is not self-closing and does not have compliant door hardware. Violation: The accessible toilet compartment door does not provide hardware and features that comply with Sections 4.17.5 and 4.13.9 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4 and 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff had difficulty using the locking mechanism on the toilet compartment door without assistance, as it requires tight grasping. Violation: The toilet compartment door has non-compliant hardware for disabled patrons, violating Sections 4.13.9, 4.17.5, & 4.27.4 of the ADAAG and Sections 309.4, & 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not use the coat hook without assistance, as it is mounted too high. Violation: There are coat hooks provided for public use in the restroom, outside the reach ranges prescribed in Sections 4.2.5, 4.2.6, and 4.25.3 of the ADAAG and Sections 308 and 604.8.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The Plaintiff was exposed to a cutting/burning hazard because the lavatory pipes are not wrapped. Violation: The lavatory pipes are not fully wrapped or insulated violating

Section 4.19.4 of the ADAAG and Section 606.5 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

- vii. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet paper dispenser without assistance, as it is not mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet paper dispenser in the accessible toilet compartment is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.17.6 and Figure 30(d) of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- viii. The Plaintiff could not exit the accessible toilet compartment without assistance, as the stall door is not located diagonally from the toilet. Violation: The accessible toilet compartment arrangement does not comply with Section 4.17.3 of the ADAAG and Section 604.8.1.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ix. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as a trashcan obstructs the clear floor space. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 & Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- x. The Plaintiff had difficulty opening the restroom door without assistance, as the door pressure to open the door is excessive. Violation: There are doors at the facility that require excessive force to open them, in violation of Section 4.13.11 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.9 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

**COUNT III - ADA VIOLATIONS AS TO PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO
PLAZA RETAIL, LL and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR
HOMESTEAD.**

30. The Plaintiff adopts and re-alleges the allegations set forth in paragraphs 1 through

25 above as though fully set forth herein.

31. Defendants, PRIME HOMES AT PORTOFINO PLAZA RETAIL, LLC and SAKE THAI LLC d/b/a SAKE THAI & SUSHI BAR HOMESTEAD, have discriminated, and continue to discriminate, against Plaintiff in violation of the ADA by failing, inter alia, to have accessible facilities by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant have 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). A list of the violations that Plaintiff encountered during his visit to the Commercial Property and the businesses within, include but are not limited to, the following:

A. Access to Goods and Services

- i. There is seating provided at the facility that does not comply with the standards prescribed in Section 4.32 of the ADAAG and Sections 226 & 902 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

B. Public Restrooms

- i. The Plaintiff could not use the lavatory without assistance, as the required knee & toe clearances are not provided. Violation: There are lavatories in public restrooms without the required clearances provided, violating the requirements in Section 4.19.2 and Figure 31 of the ADAAG and Sections 306 and 606.2 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- ii. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the clear floor space is obstructed. Violation: The required clear floor space is not provided next to the toilet, violating Section 4.16.2 and Figure 28 of the ADAAG, 28 CFR 36.211, and Section 604.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iii. The Plaintiff could not use the toilet paper dispenser without assistance, as it is not

- mounted at the required location. Violation: The toilet paper dispenser is not mounted in accordance with Section 4.16.6 and Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.7 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- iv. The Plaintiff could not use the mirror, as it is mounted too high. Violation: The mirrors provided in the restrooms are in violation of the requirements in Section 4.19.6 of the ADAAG and Section 603.3 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- v. The Plaintiff could not flush the toilet without assistance, as the flush valve is not mounted on the wide area. Violation: The flush valve is not mounted on the compliant side in violation of Section 4.16.5 of the ADAAG and Section 604.6 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vi. The Plaintiff could not transfer to the toilet without assistance, as the side grab bar is not at the required location. Violation: The grab bars do not comply with the requirements prescribed in Section 4.16.4 & Figure 29 of the ADAAG and Section 604.5.1 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.
- vii. The Plaintiff could not exit the restroom without assistance, as the required maneuvering clearance is not provided. Violation: The restroom door does not provide the required latch side clearance violating Section 4.13.6 of the ADAAG and Section 404.2.4 of the 2010 ADA Standards, whose resolution is readily achievable.

RELIEF SOUGHT AND THE BASIS

32. The discriminatory violations described in this Complaint are not an exclusive list of the Defendants' ADA violations. Plaintiff requests an inspection of the Defendants' places of public accommodation in order to photograph and measure all of the discriminatory acts violating

the ADA and barriers to access in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. Plaintiff further requests to inspect any and all barriers to access that were concealed by virtue of the barriers' presence, which prevented Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, from further ingress, use, and equal enjoyment of the Commercial; Plaintiff requests to be physically present at such inspection in conjunction with Rule 34 and timely notice. A Plaintiff requests the inspection in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief. The remediations for the ADA violations listed herein are readily achievable.

33. The Plaintiff, and all other individuals similarly situated, have been denied access to, and have been denied full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities privileges, benefits, programs and activities offered by Defendants' Commercial Property and Defendants' businesses within the Commercial Property; and has otherwise been discriminated against and damaged by the Defendants because of the Defendants' ADA violations as set forth above. The Plaintiff, and all others similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act. Plaintiff further requests a remediation plan and the opportunity to participate in the crafting of the remediation plan in order to participate in crafting a remediation plan to address Plaintiff's request for injunctive relief.

34. Defendants have discriminated against the Plaintiff by denying him access to full and equal enjoyment of the goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages and/or accommodations of their places of public accommodation or commercial facility, in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and 28 CFR 36.302 et seq. Defendants have also discriminated against

Plaintiff in violation of 42 U.S.C. § 12131 et seq. and 28 C.F.R. Part 35 et seq for excluding Plaintiff by reason of disability from participation in and denying him benefits of the services, programs, or activities of a public entity. Furthermore, the Defendants continue to discriminate against Plaintiff, and all those similarly situated, by failing to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such efforts that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services.

35. Plaintiff is without adequate remedy at law, will suffer irreparable harm, and have a clear legal right to the relief sought. Further, injunctive relief will serve the public interest and all those similarly situated to Plaintiff. Plaintiff has retained the undersigned counsel and is entitled to recover attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses from Defendants pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205 and 28 CFR 36.505.

36. Defendants are required to remove the existing architectural barriers to the physically disabled when such removal is readily achievable for their place of public similarly situated, will continue to suffer such discrimination, injury and damage without the immediate relief provided by the ADA as requested herein. In order to remedy this discriminatory situation, the Plaintiff requires an inspection of the Defendants' place of public accommodation in order to determine all of the areas of non-compliance with the Americans with Disabilities Act.

37. Notice to Defendants is not required as a result of the Defendants' failure to cure the violations by January 26, 1992 (or January 26, 1993, if a Defendant has 10 or fewer employees and gross receipts of \$500,000 or less). All other conditions precedent have been met by the

Plaintiff or waived by the Defendants.

38. Pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12188, this Court is provided with authority to grant Plaintiff's Injunctive Relief, including an order to alter the property where Defendants operate their businesses, located within the Commercial Property located at 650 NE 22nd Terrace Homestead, Florida 33033 in Miami Dade County, Florida, the interiors, exterior areas, and the common exterior areas of the Commercial Property to make those facilities readily accessible and useable to the Plaintiff and all other mobility-impaired persons; or by closing the facility until such time as the Defendants cure its violations of the ADA.

WHEREFORE, the Plaintiff, NIGEL FRANK DE LA TORRE PARDO, respectfully requests that this Honorable Court issue (i) a Declaratory Judgment determining Defendants, at the commencement of the subject lawsuit, were and are in violation of Title III of the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12181 et seq. and Title II the Americans with Disabilities Act, 42 U.S.C. § 12131; (ii) Injunctive relief against Defendants, including an order to make all readily achievable alterations to the facilities; or to make such facilities readily accessible to and usable by individuals with disabilities to the extent required by the ADA; and to require Defendants to make reasonable modifications in policies, practices or procedures, when such modifications are necessary to afford all offered goods, services, facilities, privileges, advantages or accommodations to individuals with disabilities; and by failing to take such steps that may be necessary to ensure that no individual with a disability is excluded, denied services, segregated or otherwise treated differently than other individuals because of the absence of auxiliary aids and services; (iii) An award of attorneys' fees, costs and litigation expenses pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 12205; and (iv) such other relief as the Court deems just and proper, and/or is allowable under Title II of the Americans with Disabilities Act.

Dated: October 31, 2023

GARCIA-MENOCAL & PEREZ, P.L.

Attorneys for Plaintiff

350 Sevilla Avenue, Suite 200

Coral Gables, FL 33134

Telephone: (305) 553-3464

Primary E-Mail: ajperez@lawgmp.com

Secondary E-Mail: bvirues@lawgmp.com;

jacosta@lawgmp.com

By: /s/ Anthony J. Perez

ANTHONY J. PEREZ

Florida Bar No.: 535451

BEVERLY VIRUES

Florida Bar No.: 123713